

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright et al. (6,558,191) in view of Yunker et al. (5,854,894). Applicant appreciates the interview conducted by the examiner by telephone on September 13, 2005. Although no agreement was reached, the amendments provided herein were briefly discussed with respect to the Bright et al. prior art reference. Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 21 and 25 and has added new claims 28-30. Applicant has also amended the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections under § 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the §103 rejection of claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-27 should be withdrawn as the rejections set forth in the Action fail to demonstrate that Bright et al. or Yunker et al. teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-27. Further, Applicants believe that the cited prior art fails to provide sufficient motivation that would compel one with skill in the art to combine Bright et al. with Yunker et al. and to include all the features of claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-27. In particular, there is no suggestion to combine the so-called "monolithic housing" of Yunker et al. with the "multi-transceiver assembly" of Bright et al. Applicant's invention of a monolithic housing and a base having a planar major surface is not taught or suggested by Bright et al. or Yunker et al.

Bright et al. discloses a stacked transceiver receptacle assembly including a plurality of individual transceiver receptacles, each formed by separate shielding cages. Yunker also depicts individually segmented receptacles.

Applicants' invention, and specifically the combined use of a monolithic housing defining at least two ports and a base having a planar major surface forming a single plane extending between at least two ports when the housing is attached to the base, is distinguished

from the stacked individual transceiver receptacle assembly disclosed in Bright et al., that require separate shielding cages.

Even if the Bright et al. reference was properly combinable; alone or in combination with Yunker et al., it does not disclose or render obvious Applicants' invention. Specifically, the combination of these references does not teach or suggest what is required by the Applicants' claims – a monolithic housing defining at least two ports and a base having a planar major surface forming a single plane extending between at least two ports. Bright et al. fails to teach or suggest a monolithic housing nor a planar major surface provided by a base. The base of each receptacle in Bright et al. is formed by separate individual cages – each cage having a bottom portion that only extends to enclose that individual receptacle. Applicant's claimed invention, however, requires the planar major surface to form a single plane extending between at least two ports. An example of such a feature is shown in Fig. 1 of Applicant's specification that depicts a base 40 having planar major surface 45 extending in a single plane that forms port segments 31a, 32a, 33a and 34a (see Specification, page 6). No such feature is taught or suggested by Bright et al. or Yunker et al.

The elements discussed above are included in rejected independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 27, which are now in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-12, 14-20 and 23-26 depend from the respective independent claims and include the limitations thereof and are also allowable over Bright et al. and Yunker et al.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection as to these claims and that all claims 1-30 be moved to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman  
Seyfarth Shaw LLP  
Attorneys for Assignee  
55 East Monroe Street  
Suite 4200  
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803  
312-346-8000

By 